The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 8
No. 5

MARCH
1916

"A DAGGER IN THE HEART OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE"
MAYOR THOMPSON

A CALL FOR CONCENTRATION

WOMAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES OF TODAY

WOMEN AND PREPAREDNESS

WHAT A NURSE AND NEWSPAPER WOMAN LEARNED

THE HISTORY OF ANTI-SUFFRAGE

CORRECTIONS OF SUFFRAGE STATISTICS

THE BARGAIN FOR THE BALLOT

A WARNING TO SUFFRAGISTS

AN IGNORANT INDORSEMENT?

THE STATE CAMPAIGNS

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1913, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. John Balch, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. A. J. George, Executive Secretary, Congressional Committee.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Nathan Kahn, Kate M. Gardner, Selma; Lida B. Robertson, Mobile; and Mrs. John F. Burns, Burnsville.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven; Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield; Mrs. H. H. Mason, Farmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

Organization Committee, Wilmington.
Chairman, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street, Washington.
President, Mrs. C. H. Davis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Douglas Putnam Birnie.
Third Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas T. Gaff.
Treasurer, Miss Alys Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George B. Puller.
Recording Secretary, Miss Anne Squire.
Executive Committee, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., Mrs. Swager Sherley, Mrs. E. Rollins Morse, Mrs. Arthur W. Dunn, Mrs. Charles Hussey, Miss Josephine Patten, Miss Elizabeth Davis, Miss Murray Ledyard.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Richard Cuyler King, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
Coresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. C. Moore, Macon.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. Robert J. Taylor.

IOWA

Office: 3 Hippee Building, Des Moines.
President, Mrs. Simon Casady.
Secretary, Mrs. Harry Phillips.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ralph Rollins.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Alice French, Mrs. Martin Flynn, Mrs. Leonard Harbach, Mrs. W. I. Hayes, Miss Kate Van Duzee, Mrs. Jane A. Crawford, Mrs. Mary Johnston, Mrs. C. C. Colgrove.
Advisory Committee, Mrs. N. E. Coffin, Mrs. John A. Graydon, Mrs. Richard R. Rollins, Mrs. Frank D. Jackson, Mrs. Harry Elliott, Mrs. Edwin Hewitt, Mrs. Leonard Harbach, Mrs. Harry Phillips, Mrs. Ralph E. Rollins, Mrs. C. W. Mennig, Mrs. T. W. Harper, Mrs. H. C. Alverson.

MAINE

President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. F. A. Merrill, Mrs. David W. Snow.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. E. G. Abbott.

MARYLAND

Office: 422 North Charles Street, Baltimore.
President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Haslup Adams, Mrs. Rosalie Straus, Mrs. P. Lea Thom, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose, Mrs. W. P. E. Wyse.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Nathan A. Middleton.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot.
Treasurer, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.
President, Mrs. John Balch.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline.
Chairman of Executive Committee, Miss Mary S. Ames.
Chairman of Education and Organization Committee, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam.
President Public Interests League, Mrs. B. L. Robinson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. S. Reed Anthony.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Mrs. Joseph B. Schlotman.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Walter Richardson, St. Paul; Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Minneapolis; Mrs. Edmund Pennington, Minneapolis; Mrs. E. C. Stringer, St. Paul.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
General Secretary, Miss Rita Kelley, 331 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. J. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Miss Janet M. Wallace, Mrs. Frank J. Hoel.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street, Omaha.
Mrs. J. W. Crumpacker, Special Representative National Association, 1909 Capitol Avenue, Omaha.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Mrs. Thomas Craven, Mrs. Garret A. Hobart, Mrs. John R. Emery, Mrs. William J. Libbey, Mrs. H. O. Magie, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Miss Clara Vezin, Mrs. Karl G. Roebling, Mrs. William S. Stryker, Mrs. Sherman B. Joost, Mrs. Henry M. Darcy, Mrs. Theodore C. Woodbury.
Treasurer, Mrs. George B. Yarde.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. R. C. Maxwell.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett.
General Secretary, Mrs. Orville D. Oliphant.
Finance Chairman, Mrs. John Constable Moore.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. N. C. Frick, Mrs. J. G. Gundersen, Mrs. E. B. Goss, Mrs. C. E. Wolf, Mrs. T. L. Beiseker, Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Mrs. R. H. Bosard, Miss M. O. Moyine, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

Office: 804 Neave Building, Cincinnati.
President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, Cincinnati; Mrs. Frank D. Jamison, Cincinnati; Mrs. Joseph A. Jeffrey, Columbus; Mrs. J. H. J. Upham, Columbus; Mrs. John Bradley Greene, Dayton; Mrs. Harry G. Carnell, Dayton; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. J. Herbert Roach, Cleveland; Mrs. Charles Orr, Cleveland; Mrs. Milton James, Austin; Mrs. Cyrus Newby, Hillsboro; Miss Alice Bennett, Chillicothe.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1108 Finance Building, 1426 South Penn. Square, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Miss Grace Falkner, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. John Markoe, Miss Mary Newhall, Mrs. Simeon H. Guilford.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard. Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland, Bellows Falls; Mrs. M. C. Webber, Rutland; Mrs. N. E. Phelps, Barre, and Mrs. Edward Wells, Burlington.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Postoffice Box 368, Richmond.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Otho G. Kean, Mrs. E. Randolph Williams, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. Hunsdon Cary, Mrs. E. V. Valentine, Mrs. Arthur P. Wilmer, Mrs. Henry Harwood, Mrs. Hunter McGuire.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherfoord.
Honorary Vice-President, Mrs. William L. Gray.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Coresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George H. Noyes.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

"A DAGGER IN THE HEART OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN THE UNITED STATES"

—William Hale Thompson, Mayor of Chicago

CHICAGO has become the crucible of sensational politics. Its now famous split salary scandal, started by the charges of the former superintendent of the bureau of social survey, that she had been forced to contribute one-third of her salary of $3,000 a year to the commissioner of public welfare, "stuck a dagger into the heart of woman suffrage in the United States," according to Mayor Thompson.

Even the "movies" are featuring the two women involved under the suggestive heading, "When Lovely Woman Stoops to Politics."

Members of the City Council have criticised the woman who makes the charges of having "acted in a disloyal manner to the man who appointed her" and of thereby "giving a blow to woman suffrage."

She retorts: "It was not I that gave the blow."

The ex-superintendent of the bureau of social survey, who makes the graft charges, was a suffrage leader who had the honor of being the first woman to publicly boom the candidacy of Mayor Thompson. She spoke for him throughout his campaign and insisted that "women in politics would clean up politics."

Her friends among the suffragists thought that the Mayor would appoint her as commissioner of public welfare.

Instead, he appointed another suffragist, who was a delegate to the New York Woman Suffrage Convention, to that position. She in turn, obtained the appointment of her former friend as superintendent.

When the appointment was made, according to the ex-superintendent, who resigned her position in January because, she says, she had to pay $40 graft every two weeks, the commissioner, she alleges, declared:

"Mazie says you'll have to come across."

The ex-superintendent asserts that the commissioner referred to a relative of Mayor Thompson, and demanded the money for the benefit of another relative of the Mayor's.

The commissioner replies that the entire story is a tissue of lies, and demands to know why the superintendent has kept quiet so long under the alleged graft system.

The Mayor stands by the commissioner. He accuses the ex-superintendent of perjuring herself; of being in league with his political enemies; of being actuated by jealousy on account of not having been appointed commissioner.

On the other hand, an alderman swears that he saw the superintendent give a sum of money to the commissioner. The head of a big business firm swears that he saw the superintendent cash a personal check, bearing the notation that it was for the commissioner's "special charity fund" and hand the money over to the commissioner. Moreover, a man unknown to the commissioner or superintendent, has told a newspaper that he was present, seeking employment, when the superintendent gave an envelope containing money to the commissioner in the offices of the public welfare department. A stenographer of the department declares that the ex-superintendent often complained of earning her full salary, but not receiving it all.

Other employees of the department swear that they have never been asked to contribute to the alleged graft fund.

This is the situation. No one knows which woman is right.

But everyone must admit that the affair, however it ends, is a terrible indictment of woman suffrage. Chicago politics might be no purer if women were out of it. But women *would be* out of it. That is the salient point, and the more publicity that the split salary scandal receives, the more evident it will become that woman *should be* out of politics. One woman's good name is worth more to her husband and children than the vote is to her sex.

For this reason THE WOMAN'S PROTEST will publish the names of neither of these women.

(Chattanooga, Tenn., *Times*)

THIS melancholy drift of the suffrage movement is most significantly illustrated in the trial now on in Chicago, wherein one [woman] charges that she was compelled to divide her salary as an employee of the Civil Service Commission with her superior officer, head of the city department of public welfare. Such things have been known to happen in communities where men have built up political machines, but it has been asserted that when women got the suffrage nothing of the sort could ever occur. And as if to make the proceedings more horrifying to the public conscience, it appears from the statement of the Associated Press in the Chattanooga *Times* of Saturday morning that when the attorneys wanted to know of the commissioner whether her husband accompanied her on a certain visit she had made to Europe in 1905 he was warned by counsel that "you had better let that matter alone"; that it was "loaded," and that "there are many persons who live in glass houses," the inference being that there were many hidden things it would not do for the defense to try to bring out. The question was not pressed, we are told, and the public is left to conjecture.

The main satisfaction to the public in these recent developments in the progress of the woman's suffrage program is that the vast majority of the good women who oppose the cult, seeing the danger to the home, to society and to the spiritual unity of the nation threatened by their mad sisters rushing for the ballot, may take a more potential interest hereafter in combating and defeating the movement.

(Bloomington, Ill., *Daily Bulletin*)

A COUPLE of Chicago women placed at the heads of departments under the Big Bill Thompson reform movement have quarreled and the washing is something prodigious. One woman official makes affidavit and brings witnesses to show that the other woman official closer to the throne mulcted her for a third of her salary ostensibly for support of relatives of the mayor. The accused one, of course, denied it all and to-day the other one comes back with even fiercer expose. She avers that the lady who relieved her of her salary carried on the payrolls of the office dummy names and proposed to her to go in on a dummy stenography and divide salary, assuring her that it was the common practice at the city hall.

Telling of her indignation at being offered such temptation, the accuser says: "I went over to my attorney, Seymour Stedman, and told him about it and said, 'Steddie, can you beat it? What does she take me for?' and Steddie replied, 'Why didn't you biff her in the nose?'"

Some people said that the entrance of woman in politics would have a refining influence on the system, while others contended that the environment would simply coarsen the woman and bring her to the level of the male ward boss.

You get the answer in this Chicago case. Further comment is unnecessary.

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. VIII March, 1916 No. 5

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

A CALL FOR CONCENTRATION

THE action of the House Judiciary Committee on February 15th, in postponing consideration of the woman suffrage amendment until December, 1916, eliminates for the present the possibility of getting votes-for-women through Congressional action.

Nevertheless, the determination announced by the suffragists to carry on the fight "exactly as if this had not occured" as Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt said, must convince anti-suffragists throughout the country that our work is not completed.

There are three important State campaigns this year in Iowa, South Dakota and West Virginia. Also, Missouri may vote on the question again in 1916. As we won the five Central States in 1914, and the four great Eastern States in 1915, so must we win the campaign States of 1916 in order to effectually protect the womanhood of this nation from the misfortune of being cast into politics.

Every State organization is busy in its own territory, and the workers are all too few. The women who are anti-suffragists, who know that they are doing work more important than anything they could do in politics, are often too deeply engaged in their home and civic enterprises even to join a movement to protect themselves from suffrage. We have their support and sympathy, and every analysis of the election returns on this subject shows that it is they, the quiet wives and mothers of America, who urge their husbands, sons and fathers to vote "No."

Every State president knows how many women there are in her community who heartily approve anti-suffrage activity, but who cannot give the time and energy to take part in it.

Regardless of our overwhelming majorities, we must face the fact that over three-quarters of the adult women are married, and over two-thirds of the women are doing their own housework for a family of five. They cannot take part in anti-suffrage politics, much less State and National politics. The few who want votes, however, are represented in the main by women who have achieved a great measure of "freedom" without it. The number of unmarried women among suffrage leaders is well known.

Out of their less than ten per cent. of adherents among the women, the suffragists are nearly always able to get more active workers than we can muster out of the ninety per cent. And it is this fact that would give them the advantage over the normal woman if all were enfranchised. It is by use of a vociferous few that they hope to bring about feminism, while the many are indifferent or busy outside of politics.

Therefore, we must concentrate our forces to the best advantage. We must send our active workers to the front, where the fighting is most severe. A State organization can always employ all of its active workers in perfecting home defense within its own borders, but it is often of more importance to stop the enemy before it gets to our borders.

The suffragists have hurled into Iowa the pick of their army, recruited from England to California. They have thousands with which to perfect their organization of that State; and to spend on their customary "stunts" to attract attention. We know from previous experience that there is nothing they will scruple to say or publish to our discredit, and that much of their sophistry, perversion of facts, and insincerity will pass for truth unless it is challenged and corrected.

They claim to have reached by personal appeal sixty per cent. of the voters of New York City. In Iowa, with fewer voters and those more easily reached, they will not let one escape their deluge of the suffrage arguments of 1848, or of the attacks on anti-suffragists of 1916.

Every anti-suffragist knows that there is no danger in any State where the people have a fair opportunity to hear both sides. We have proved that among one-third of the people of the United States within three years, and in some States, we have proved it twice.

But there is many a man, in Iowa as elsewhere, who has never heard an anti-suffrage argument. We must make impossible such a condition of affairs, which is so favorable to our opponents and their methods.

We must have the fundamental truths about our opposition to woman suffrage as well known among the people as are the fundamental principles of any other political question. All the voters know what the Democratic party stands for, what the Republican party stands for; and anyone can guess what woman suffrage stands for who has ever seen or heard of a suffragist. An equal knowledge of anti-suffrage facts and fundamentals would make the enfranchisement of women in any other State impossible, and would lead to the gradual repeal of double suffrage in the States which have already adopted it. But to spread this education over a continent and among fifty million adults is no little task. Not every voter even reads the newspapers, and many who do skip everything but the sporting and business pages. Besides, where suffragists can, they always suppress the publication of any anti-suffrage material whatever, and make it difficult and unpleasant for the editors who will print the facts.

We must have publicity, organization and personal work which shall be as broadcast and efficient as that of one of the big parties, in order to end this suffrage agitation decisively within the next five years. And at the present time, all are most needed in Iowa, and later in West Virginia and South Dakota, even when giving them means a sacrifice in the work of the other States.

"IOWA is a strategic State. If Iowa loses, South Dakota will lose. If Iowa fails it will be a tremendous blow to the movement in the United States."—Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt.

Mrs. Catt is right. When suffrage loses in Iowa, the women will win another great victory in the country-wide campaign to protect themselves from being forced into the maelstrom of politics.

WOMAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES OF TODAY

An Address by Mrs. L. V. Haley, President Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs

WOMAN has been the subject of much speculation and discussion ever since the indiscretion of Eve made her the subject of neighborhood gossip.

Persons with skill in the use of words seem in all ages to have worked overtime in analyzing her moods, diagnosing her symptoms, laughing at her caprices, and warning their brother mortals against her wiles.

So it is not surprising that at the present day there is much ado about woman, and that she is being now, as ever, alternately analyzed and classified, scandalized and deified.

The criticisms which have voiced the result of all this study have been diverse, divergent, and—diverting; Lotze tells us that the female hates analysis—Lafitte that the female prefers analysis; Pope says she is a rake at heart—while Kingsley calls her the missionary of civilization; Ellis says that a love of change and nervous irritability have ever been her peculiar characteristics; Mobius, that women hate all innovations and are strongly conservative; Lecky, that women are superior in instinctive virtues and in those which arise from a sense of duty—Lombroso, that there is a half-criminaloid being in every normal woman; Bachhofer, that law and justice are innate with women—Hartmann, that the whole sex is unjust and unfair.

WHAT HAS WOMAN DONE?

To many of us who are somewhat weary of being either the subject of psychological conjecture or the object of sociological investigation there comes the thought: What has woman done to bring upon herself so much notoriety and publicity? Is there any reason for the mountains of cheap literature which advertise her so brazenly, and speak of her as if she were some rare, fearsome, and newly discovered species of animal? It is true that the present day woman is doing wonderful things, but why so much comment about it? Has not woman done wonderful things? It is true that woman is now taking an active part in shaping civilization and society, but has not civilization always been partly the work of woman? Then why all this hue and cry? Why have all the conventions of womanly sensibility, modesty and privacy gone down like the walls of Jericho?

It is because of the continuous self-laudation and self-advertisement of certain unwise members of our sex who, like Pan in his immortal dance, are rushing on and on singing,

"We don't know where we're going,
But we're on the way."

It is because woman herself is making the period one of self-glorification and self-gratification as to achievement rather than one of realization and anxiety as to responsibility.

And just so long as she continues to talk about what a success she is and how much she is getting out of life, and loses sight of what a failure she will be if she does not put something worth while into life, for just that long will she be accused of a disregard for essentials, be spoken of as a faddist and an extremist, and be laughed at as a promoter of ill-considered and reckless innovations.

LOOKING FOR FUNDAMENTALS

A habit of sorting over the stuff of which life is made enables one to select the important things and to put the little ones where they belong, so let us take counsel together and find out what are the fundamentals of this great woman movement which we are hearing so much about—this movement which teems with possibilities and with power.

The spirit of the modern age which has worked such transformation among the sons of men has touched as with a magic wand the daughters also, and to-day woman's sphere of influence is wider, her field of work is larger, her door of opportunity is broader than ever before.

Influence—work—opportunity. These are the fundamentals of the woman movement which have placed upon woman a responsibility which she herself does not sufficiently appreciate.

How will she acquit herself of this responsibility?

Will she use her influence worthily, will she choose her work wisely, will she face her opportunity reverently?

INFLUENCE OF WOMAN

There has never been a time in the history of the world when woman did not hold within her hand much of man's welfare, man's achievement, and man's faith in himself and God. She has ever been able to fire him with ambition, to spur him to action or to make of him a coward and a drone. To-day woman's influence is greater even than in times past, and the use which she makes of her influence is one of her gravest responsibilities.

Influence in the lives of others can be used as a weight to drag down, or as wings to bear up. The person who possesses influence can be a demon of destruction or an angel of light. Woman's influence is limitless—will she use it safely, sanely, unselfishly?

The function of woman in purifying, spiritualizing, humanizing society for good and every person with whom she comes in contact is the highest of all human functions. It means the building of character, and to build character is a work beside which the building of pyramids, railroads, canals and cathedrals pales into insignificance. To raise the standard of life is a harder task than to dig a tunnel, to shape a life is a higher task than to shape a platform or a policy, and to make men and women is a nobler task than to govern them after they are made.

"What makes a city great and strong?
Not architecture's graceful strength,
Nor factories' extended length—
But men who see the civic wrong
And give their lives to make it right,
And turn its darkness into light.

"What makes a city full of power?
Not wealth's display, nor titled fame,
Nor fashion's loudly boasted claim—
But women rich in virtue's dower,
Whose homes, though humble, still are great
Because they make men for the State."

Civilization itself is dependent on what woman does with her influence, for women make the atmosphere of the home from which men form their ideals and derive their ambitions. If in the home children are taught foresight and self-control, and grow up with a strong regard for the laws and decencies of life, it is at once a guarantee of a high order of civilization. Napoleon recognized this when he said: "What France needs is good mothers, and then we need not fear about France having good sons."

INFLUENCE LIVES ON

The woman, then, who would truly serve her kind, and leave a lasting impression for good upon her family and her community, should not be ambitious for power, for authority, but

should care much for influence—for as Lyman Abbott so beautifully says: "Power acts from without, influence from within; power controls, influence creates; power dies with the death of the person who possesses it, influence lives on and on in ever-widening circles after the death of the person who exercised it."

The question of whether or not woman's influence is greater when it is known to be disinterested, when it does not rest on authority, or on business or political expediency, is a vital one, and merits our thoughtful consideration, for in the settlement of this question woman takes upon herself a very great responsibility.

Through the process of evolution the old order in the industrial world has changed and given place to the new, and in this new order woman's economic function has provoked more discussion and caused more difference of opinion than any other phase of the woman question.

WHAT IS WOMAN'S TRUE FIELD?

The marked ability which women are at present showing in many departments of public work, and in a wide range of industrial pursuits as well as in the management of their homes, naturally brings up the question as to what is woman's true field—or, in other words, what is her economic function, her vocation?

In primitive days the doorway of a house was the dividing line between man's and woman's kingdom. Beyond that door man tilled the soil and tended the flocks, while inside woman baked and brewed into food, and wove and sewed into garments the raw material which he brought her.

In later times when progress and prosperity brought increased desires and duties, and our grandmothers with the help of servants performed the manifold duties of the home, there was still a sharp division between man's and woman's labor.

About the middle of the last century, however, a change in economic conditions, brought about by the invention of labor saving devices, caused a corresponding change in the character and scope of woman's work. With the advent of the spinning jenny and the sewing machine the deft hands which had heretofore carded wool and spun flax, and the busy fingers which had put together garments of linen and linsey, were left idle—and what to do with the leisure thus acquired was a serious problem then and is a burning question with sociologists now.

If we are to judge by what woman herself is saying we infer that, like many who have just inherited vast possessions, she seems uncertain what she will do with her newly acquired riches. For we have one group clamoring to be economic units; another group equally as clamorous to become political entities; others demanding that they be allowed to live their own lives and have their beautiful souls understood; and still others insisting that unless the human race is to die out woman must attend to her divinely appointed business of motherhood.

"LORDS OF CREATION" LAUGH

Our magazines and newspapers are greatly agitated on the subject, and are filled with controversies on the woman question and with hot polemics on the feminist mind. Meanwhile "the lords of creation" are slyly laughing in their sleeves. Every man saying to himself that if Everywoman had as good a husband as his wife has there would be no "Woman Movement," no sociological studies of "Woman's Sphere," and no ponderous analysis of the "Industrial Condition of Women."

The effect of all this clamor and contention is to make us call to mind what good old John Knox said about "the monstriferous empire of woman" and wonder if it is not a lack of good, sound, everyday common sense which is at the bottom of all the restlessness which has made present day moralists dub us "the unquiet sex."

Beneath all the froth and bubble and floating rubbish, however, there is the strong, steady current of desire on the part of the great mass of our women to be of use in the world, and those who will best serve their sex are those who will discover into what channels of usefulness the energies of women can be most rationally and fittingly directed.

Today we find woman working in schools, colleges, hospitals, courts, pulpits, editorial chairs, and throughout the domain of art, science and industry. And while it is true that she is filling many of these places with credit to herself and with benefit to society, it is also true that radical changes in industrial and social conditions are constantly forcing the modern woman into occupations and modes of life which neither nature nor Providence ever intended her to enter. There are many vocations which women are now following that involve a degree of physical and nervous strain, a sort of mental and emotional attitude, which not one woman in a thousand can stand without disaster or deterioration.

HOME MOST IMPORTANT PLACE

Even though woman is worthily taking a hand in many matters of great importance to both the individual and the community we must not overlook the fact that her first and most important place is in the home. It is well and good that she be interested in matters of civic improvement, public health, better educational methods, and the care of the neglected, the dependent, the deficient, and the delinquent, but these interests should never be allowed to interfere with the management of her home or the mental and moral training of her children.

Now it is a most singular fact that whenever anything is said about woman's place being in the home there is a certain type of woman who always takes the statement as a challenge, and who immediately begins to declaim that "all women know that woman's place is in the home." I have often wondered why this is so, and if it was not a case of cap-fitting?

A MOTHER'S CHIEF BUSINESS

That many women are permitting outside interests to divert their time and attention from their homes is a lamentable fact, but one which is proved by the following significant words uttered at the Chicago Biennial by George J. Kneeland, inspector of the Chicago vice commission.

"I have on my list the names of over 500 girls (in Chicago alone, mind you), who come not from the slums, from the factory with its low wage, but from well-to-do, respectable homes. These girls are not forced by economic necessity to go into careers of vice, nor are they feeble minded or sub-normal in any way—they simply lack the home interest, the home training, the home amusement, and a knowledge of the facts of life, which it is a mother's duty to provide. It is largely the mother's fault that there are so many girls of this type." A fearful arraignment of mothers, is it not? and oh, the pity of it! Have you any doubt as to what is woman's business or that some of them had better get about it?

The right ordering and rendering of the services connected with the home is unquestionably woman's distinctive function, and it is a function just as useful, just as necessary, just as honorable as law, banking, or manufacture. As one writer says: "If for man the economic ideal is the effective direction of production, woman can make hers the intelligent ordering of consumption. The economic unit thus becomes not a man or a woman, but a man and a woman—and though of a different sort the services of women in the home are no less vital and no less valuable than the services of men in marts of trade, in legislative halls, or on fields of battle.

"To make home habitable and life livable for her family is a task so precious that the woman who risks it in an attempt to imitate or rival the activities of man robs the world of her most valuable contribution. And when she sacrifices her mission of home-maker for economic achievement, political preferment, or social distinction, she sells her birthright for a miserable mess of pottage, and utterly fails to discharge her highest responsibility."

SULPHURIC ACID NEEDED

Lamartime says, "He who would write of woman should dip his pen in rainbow hues and powder his lines with the gold dust of butterflies' wings," but from a perusal of some of our present day journals one would conclude that the modern paraphrase of that saying is, "He who would write of woman should use a stick of caustic and sprinkle his page with plenty of sulphuric acid."

Now has it ever occurred to you that woman (in the abstract) is always spoken of with reverence and has rhetorical flowers thrown at her feet, but that women (in concrete form) generally evoke restrained mirth or good natured jibes? Why is this so? Is it because abstractly woman is an idea of God's, and is therefore to be treated reverently—but concretely women are what they themselves have made of God's idea, that they have not done their work well, and therefore are to be spoken of lightly?

If this is true, the responsibility rests upon all right-minded women of proving to the world that the women who are spoken of lightly—the sensation-loving, notoriety-craving members of the sex who constantly flaunt themselves and their affairs in the public press—that these women are but a fractional percentage.

FAITH IN MAJORITY

I am happy to say that I have profound faith in the earnestness and integrity of the great majority of our women, in their conscientiousness and their tendency to cling to ideals. I believe that after the present excitement has had time to run its course even those women who are now most intemperate in dress, speech and action will come to their senses and be guided by reason and decorum. Then all the unrest in family life, the increase in divorce, the lack of social standards, which at present are such alarming social symptoms will disappear.

Upon the modern woman rests the responsibility of showing to the world that the ideal of womanhood which has come down to us with the stamp of approval upon it—the ideal which the most advanced woman has not yet been able to improve upon—that this ideal can be realized. She has the opportunity to so think, so speak, so act, that it will be said of her, the heart of humanity may safely trust in her. "Strength and dignity are her clothing. She looketh well to the ways of her household and eateth not the bread of idleness.

"She openeth her mouth with wisdom and the law of kindness is on her tongue. She spreadeth out her hand to the poor and reacheth forth her hands to the needy. Her children shall rise up and call her blessed, and her works shall praise her in the gates." Upon her also rests the responsibility of proving that woman can use her influence nobly and perform her mission as mother and homemaker faithfully; that she can keep the balance between the nearer and the wider duties; that she can meet the new demands of community life without sacrificing those of family life; and that she can be progressive and yet dare not to know and not to do many things.

MANY SERIOUS PROBLEMS

Our tasks are many, our problems are serious and far-reaching. As faithful loyal women let us assume them and go forth resolved to do our duty, with the consciousness that each worthy effort will bring us nearer the ideal and will hasten the crowning of a brighter day.

And as we strive, let us take for our watchword the Oriental sage's greeting of the dawn: "Yesterday is but a dream, and to-morrow is only a vision. But to-day well lived will make yesterday a dream of happiness and to-morrow a vision of hope."

Yesterday with its yearnings and strivings is gone. Let us seize to-day with its promise and its possibilities and do our work as best we can and we may be sure that to-morrow will be the brighter, and those who come after us the happier and the better because of what we have tried to do.

I'M WANTIN' TO QUIT

By Mrs. George Fort Milton

THIS poem, reprinted from the Atlanta *Constitution*, reveals the impulse of woman, even when a suffrage leader, to forsake politics for her natural work. According to reports, Mrs. John M. Kennedy, joint chairman of the Tennessee Equal Suffrage Campaign Committee, wrote to Mrs. George Fort Milton, an eminent suffrage leader of Chattanooga, urging her to further suffrage activity. Mrs. Milton replied in verse as follows:

Kenny, I'm wantin' to quit.
I'm tired of battles per jaws!
I'd faint at the sight
Of an inkpot all right,
And scream at more "laws" and "by-laws."
Believe me, I'm taking the bit,
And mean to kick out of the Cause.
I don't care a—rat
If we win, and all that,
I want to buck out—just "Because."

Kenny, I'm crazy to quit.
I've grip and the grouch—that's enough.
The props are knocked out
Of my suffragette spout,
I'm sick of the masculine stuff.
"Oh, mother—turn backward—to-night
And make me—again"—just a goose,
The "clinging vine" sort,
That's the thing that one ought
To affect—not a brain!—What's the use?

I sigh for that "place in the home"
While I eat in a railroad cafe.
The vote takes one minute,
If we could but win it,
But this suffrage war takes for aye.
I'm heart-sick and hoarse as a jay
And wornout with having to pray
"Our rights, men! Our rights!"
For a change gimme tights.
I'd rather stay home and crochet.

My house is a sight—so am I!
I've mislaid my "figure" and brush;
My bills are unpaid,
My fond friends have strayed,
And I rush in the goldurnest rush.
There's no time for nothin' at all,
But suffrage by night and by day.
It's too big to do
In a cycle or two—
Let's crawl out from under—and stay.

Kenny, think of it a bit;
Not to rush, nor to reason, nor plan;
Just to let things wag on
As they did years agone,
And leave all the blame upon—Man!
We offer to share half his load
And coddle the world like a kid,
But the slick politicians
And fools say, "Conditions
Would go all to smash," if we did.

Let's let them run things into smash!
Let's don't raise our hand to stop wars!
Let's not do the work
That the best of men shirk—
And give as our reason—"Because"
I crave some new clothes right away.
I want a sole day to myself,
To knead out the wrinkles,
And get back the twinkles
And be "sweet" and "dear"—not an elf.

I pine just "to shine in the home"
And make my home shine as it should;
To play with my babies
And read "M. T. Davies;"
And, best of all, be "understood."
I'm an old-fashioned woman at heart—
All women are, under the crust,
Why don't the men give US
The vote—trust it with us!—
And not spoil our good tempers fust?

WOMEN AND PREPAREDNESS

By Agnes Repplier

(From *The Woman's Home Companion*)

CITIZENSHIP embraces women as well as men. Whether they live in States which permit them to vote, or in States which withhold this privilege, is a matter of no moment. Their influence and their responsibilities are everywhere the same. They cannot escape their duty to their country by pleading their averseness to suffering, by dwelling on the fears and sorrows of motherhood. To hear them, one would imagine that no father ever felt a pang of anxiety or regret. They cannot claim for themselves a higher morality on the score of their lower hardihood. Civic morality consists in putting the good of the State above the good of the individual. It has no other test. On the readiness of the citizen to serve the State, to defend it, and, if need be, to die for it, was reared the civilization of the world.

Because so many American women aspire soberly to the franchise, because they seek their share of work, of control, of political prestige, because, presumably, they desire to be of service to the public it is incumbent upon them to put aside their feminine sensibility and their feminine fears. They should be as stout-hearted and as strong-minded as their grandmothers, who were not wont to flinch under the compelling goad of duty. It is also incumbent upon them to inform themselves accurately upon subjects about which they hold and express opinions. Ignorance, which palliates the errors of the child, increases the culpability of the adult. As we cannot escape from the consequences of our words and deeds, we should see to it that they have knowledge and reason back of them, that they are not swayed by sentiment, blinded by incomprehension, or tarnished by selfishness.

It would be harsh to censure women for clinging to catchwords and generalities. Such catchwords and such generalities are the props of the speechmaker, and are equally popular with both sexes. "Legalized murder," "hysteria of homicide," "tribal God," "moral revolt," "sons of mothers" (necessarily!), "mother-half of humanity," "Custodians of human life,"—these are stars in the firmament of oratory. What do women mean, or what do they think they mean, when they say they are training their sons to fight in "bloodless battle" for their fellow men; or that they would have them sacrifice their lives "only for the conservation of life"? They must attach some especial significance to phrases so majestic; but they offer no explanation. What these women are probably doing, or what their ignored husbands are probably doing, is giving their sons a business education to fit them for positions in banks or telephone companies. A perfectly legitimate thing to do; but why speak of it as a step in the moral liberation of mankind?

Too much stress has been laid on the authority of motherhood. It is part of the sentimentalism of the day. Children are not pawns in the game of life. They are rational creatures, who, coming to the age of understanding, must work out their own salvation. The song "I Didn't Raise my Boy to be a Soldier" is not worthy of the praise or the censure it has received. No mother raises her boy to be a soldier, or a tanner, or a salesman, or an electrician. The utmost she can achieve (again with the neglected father's help) is to raise her boy to be a man; and when he has reached man's estate, he must do what his manhood authorizes. No other course is open to him. He is the captain of his soul, and must answer to God and the State for the fulfillment of his duties as a human being and as a citizen.

The only consistent pacifist is the one who preaches the doctrine of non-resistance, and is prepared to live up to its dictates. Such a true believer (a woman) wrote recently: "If our nation were a moral unit, and all of one mind; if we submitted to foreign aggression, refusing to fight for our freedom, and permitting our loved ones to be slain rather than defend them by violence, should we not achieve a moral victory—the greatest since the dawn of Christianity?"

This is lifting national policy into the realm of pure ethics, and leaving it there. Discussion is valueless, because no nation would ever "of one mind" submit to invasion. The old simple belief, instilled by nature and endorsed by Christianity, that it is not only our sacred right but our sacred duty to defend our homes from assault, still holds good. It will never be outgrown by the world.

But the non-resistent faces the situation honestly. He or she may be in error, but there is no attempt to evade the crucial issue, as is the case with pacifists who would have us believe that we can escape war by being unprepared for war, or that there is no added peril in defencelessness. The cartoon of Uncle Sam opening his tattered umbrella, with the remark, "Here's hoping it doesn't rain!" expresses the attitude of men and women to whom history has taught nothing. Why should we deem ourselves safe? The ocean offers no more protection in this century than did the Mediterranean five hundred years ago. A large civilian population offers no more protection now than it did when Theodoric overran Italy. We cannot say that we are in nobody's way, for we are distinctly in the way of the coveted South American trade. We cannot say that we are not worth invading. When Field-Marshal Blücher gazed upon the splendor of London, he said with the robust simplicity of his race, "What a town to loot!" The splendor of New York, lying defenceless on her beautiful harbor, is enough to make old Blücher turn regretfully in his grave. Our treasury is bursting with the Allies' gold. Our wealth, like the wealth of Carthage, is an affront to the world. Our neutrality has won for us neither friendship nor respect. It has not protected us from repeated affronts. It has not saved our citizens—men, women and children—from destruction. The sinking of the "Lusitania," the "Arabic," the "Hesperian" and the "Ancona" were tributes paid to our limitless forbearance. Whatever may be our capacity for self-deception, we can hardly base our hopes for the future upon the tenderness shown us in the past.

With these grim truths staring us in the face, sentimentalities are futile, and civic selfishness is treason to the Republic. Nobody likes taxes, nobody wants war. But to wince under the burden imposed by citizenship, or to evade the service it demands, is unworthy of American men and women. To take refuge in high-flown phrases, to cloud the simple issues with meaningless oratory, is a foolish waste of words. An impassioned woman speaker, addressing the International Peace Congress in San Francisco last October, implored Americans to refuse all measures of defense, because by so doing they would "inaugurate a new policy," assume "world-leadership," and constitute themselves the saviors, not of Europe only, but of the Latin republics and the Orient. "This is a time," she fervidly announced, "which commands every patriot solemnly to choose whether this great nation shall lead Asia upward, or drag her with ourselves down to the level of terror and conscription on which Europe will live, if we follow her past example."

Anything less relevant than this burst of eloquence would be hard to find. It may be our appointed task to "lead Asia upward," to constitute the United States a guardian angel, or a nursery governess, to these ancient and highly sophisticated

races. The duties involved would not lack variety. China is as peaceable as a rabbit. All she asks, or has ever asked, is to be let alone. Japan has been a nation of warriors since the thirteenth century, when she routed the forces of the great Genghis Khan, and preserved her freedom. And India—but it cannot be meant that we should lead India anywhere. She is so inconceivably remote, so strongly allied, so tenacious of her inheritance. Why should we suddenly assume these expansive responsibilities, and shut our eyes to duties near at hand. Why prate about "world leadership"—a thing we do not covet—and ignore our own safety, which is of paramount importance? Whether the Oriental nations would or would not be morally uplifted by our defenceless harbors, whether they would or would not respect our motives in so enfeebling ourselves, whether they would or would not follow our perilous example, are points which may be left where they belong—in the great world of conjecture. They are of concern only to the speech-maker. Most of us feel that Asia can wait while we look after the pressing needs of the United States, that sentimentalities can be pushed aside in favor of facts and figures. * * * * * * * * *

It would be absurd to say that preparedness will keep a nation out of war. Nothing can insure us from attack. Neutrality is as much protection as a baby's rattle. But preparedness will enormously decrease the chances of war. Any aggressor, be he a burglar, a bandit, or an emperor, is materially influenced by the possibilities of resistance. Preparedness will also give us a fighting chance if we are attacked, which is a point deserving consideration. It is worth while to remind mothers that they have daughters as well as sons, and that the fate of women in a defenseless country may be something too evil to contemplate.

* * * * * *

The time has come now for women to discard emotionalism, to abandon once and for all those selfish considerations which they have christened "moral revolt" and "moral supremacy," and to stop talking as if their sons remained forever little boys, to whom they were afraid to give toy guns lest they should run out and shoot the little boy next door. They should assume soberly and understandingly their share of solicitude and self-sacrifice. They should give their glad assent and their powerful assistance to all protective measures.

WHAT A NURSE, TEACHER AND NEWSPAPER WOMAN LEARNED ABOUT SUFFRAGE

By Frances Corning Boardman

IN the face of a possibility that the next two or three decades will see the women of the whole United States voting on an equal political basis with men, the amount of time and space devoted to the discussion of an extended franchise is not surprising, nor is it wasted.

Whatever one's individual opinion, the issue has to be faced.

And quite naturally, of course, it is the voices of the propagandists that are heard most persistently in the land, for the great, silent majority on the other side of the question is composed mainly of those who are too indifferent, too dazed, too disgusted, or too genuinely heartsick to protest. But—they are the majority, still; remember that.

If you have investigated the subject at all, you have found that it is very difficult for an aggressive suffragist to allow brains, sincerity or enterprise to stand to the credit of disbelievers. But then bigotry is the greatest motive power of almost any propaganda, so that is a condition to be accepted as inevitable.

All the same, though, there is the case for the opposition, and I sometimes think that its very obviousness and simplicity prevent its being more frequently formulated. Somehow it always seems quite adequately comprehended in the statement, "Male and female created He them." He did, and it is a fact that we cannot get back of, nor push out of sight.

It goes without saying that we have all frequently been impressed by the plausible logic and the utter sincerity of certain suffrage promoters—even those of us who heartily disagree with their premises and purpose. But personally, the more I heard and read and see of the whole idea, the less faith I have in its efficacy in any direction at all, and I persist in thinking that my means of observation have been wider than those of the average woman, and my conclusions correspondingly legitimate.

Moreover, I belong to the class most frequently quoted as being in desperate need of direct political representation—the class composed of unmarried, self-supporting women.

Like many other American girls, I was obliged, while still in my 'teens, to equip myself with a profession. A kindergarten training was judged the best thing available, and I took the course, the close of which found me ensconced as combination teacher, mother and playmate to the youngsters in a State hospital for crippled and deformed children.

I was still very young when this experience initiated me into the soul-sickening mysteries of inherited disease, and in these days, when it has become so common for beautifully-gowned ladies to mount palm-decked platforms and discourse on equal suffrage as a sure road to moral hygiene, I often smile, as I contrast their probable opportunities of knowing the real truth, with those that I have had.

How many of these social evangelists have worked and played daily with little boys and girls whose doom is written upon them in one frightful scar after another?

How many of them have loved and petted and taught babies whose pitful days were numbered by their grandfathers before them?

I know what it means, and if I believed that an extended franchise could remedy these things, then I should work for it, too. But I cannot believe it.

A life-long desire to be a trained nurse came to the fore as soon as I was old enough to be accepted for probation in a representative training-school, and for a while I saw active service in the free wards of one of New York's leading hospitals.

That added a few more chapters to what I already knew of the realities of life.

There followed a year of teaching in a public school kindergarten situated in a semi-slum district, and then I drifted into newspaper work.

As with most women who adopt that profession nowadays, I have had very much to do with feminine activities of all kinds; I have attended countless suffrage meetings, and feminist lectures of every sort, and I have interviewed countless devotees of the "cause;" I have read endless piles of literature, and heard endless clever discussions, and my inner consciousness presents but one answer to it all—it won't work.

And I can never say it to myself without a smile, for as a piece of humor truly Homeric in its proportions, I believe the whole feminist movement stands without a parallel.

I suppose it is my serene, unshakable belief in the superiority of my own sex, and in the inherent dignity of its several functions, that makes me resent so deeply this wholesale, and pathetically unimaginative scheme for advertising its merits.

It is as though one set seriously about the business of printing tracts to call public attention to the value of sun and rain, or of maintaining a lecture bureau devoted to spreading the news that the animal kingdom offers an interesting field for study.

Yes, if one could not smile, one would weep with mortification at the indignity that is being heaped upon the sex by its

alleged champions. It is a noisy age, though, and a certain number of women are taking full advantage of the temper of the times, to let off steam.

The greatest difficulty in following the logic of the suffragists lies in trying to reconcile their two basic slogans: "We don't want special consideration because we are women—we want to stand on an equal footing with men," and, "We ought to have political equality because we are women, and our special standpoint is essential to the right adjustment of social relationships."

And there you are. The fact that they are women must be taken into account—and it musn't be taken into account. Why, oh why, don't they accept their age-long privilege of being contrary and contradictory instead of trying to make a whim take on the semblance of logic? The disguise is much too thin.

How is it, I wonder, when male citizens surrender street-car seats to them? Is it an offense, or merely a matter of simple justice? Personally, I am always delighted when that particular courtesy is shown me, and it never seems to me that I am being complimented in the act nearly so much as is the woman who was responsible for the man's up-bringing.

"My vote," said a friend of mine who lives in a suffrage State, "is always lost, as well as those of hundreds of other women, because we dare not register, knowing that it renders us liable for jury duty. I have two little children and no servants, and you can see how such service would be out of the question."

I have mentioned this phase of matters to numerous suffragists, who merely raise their eyebrows at my ignorance, and remark that it is very easy to get excused—plenty of men do it.

Yes, they do, of course, but not in any such numbers, because the claims on a man's time and upon that of a wife and mother, are of a totally different nature. It simply means that the most normal and representative type of woman that we have is to be admitted to the duties of citizenship on a very much restricted scale.

This one department, for instance, important as it is, is closed to her, practically, and for purely sex reasons. Nature, and not society has imposed the barrier.

Every anti-suffragist has discovered that the last shaft of contempt is supposed to have been levelled at her when she is called Early- or Mid-Victorian by her scornful sisters, but devastating as it may sound, this nettle of speech becomes quite harmless when seized and examined closely.

I am thinking just now of my grandmother, who died not very long ago. She was a little girl when Victoria came to the throne. Married while very young, her honeymoon trip was made mostly by wagon through two Middle Western States, to the tiny pioneer settlement which was to be her home.

She managed to bring up eleven children to healthy maturity, and to make herself indispensable to the community as a domestic pattern, a wonderful nurse in times of illness, a counsellor, friend, or teacher, as the need might be.

Wherever there was any occasion for the display of sympathy or of competency in almost any line, she was the woman sent for. And she also managed, quite simply and naturally, not only to keep her graces of mind and body, but to maintain so keen and intelligent an interest in world affairs that, when the progress of events sent her husband to Washington, she was able to slip gracefully into her place in official society, to become known as one of its distinct assets.

To the end of her life she retained those qualities which made her a notable little figure in more than one city, and I have yet to see the advanced feminist who has anything better to offer by way of contribution to the uplift.

There were countless other wonderful women in that same generation; what of the "Mid-Victorian" women who served so faithfully throughout the Civil War? What of England's own Florence Nightingale, and the "Good Little Queen" herself?

No, here again I part company with my excited sisters—I cannot agree with their smug assumption of superiority over preceding generations.

"Do you expect women to be drudges—mere pieces of household machinery?" is one of their favorite questions, always uttered in deeply affronted tones.

Well, there, it seems to me, is a proposition that is settled unconditionally by circumstance. If you are the mother of a family, and cannot afford to keep servants, then I suppose you will have to be tied down pretty firmly; there doesn't seem to be any way out of it as long as people need to be fed and clothed, and premises have to be taken care of.

If you have one servant, then more of your time will be your own, and if you can employ several, then there is a distinct obligation imposed on you to cultivate not only the domestic graces, but as many more as possible, to the positive benefit of your family.

There is no possible connection between the extension of the franchise and the amount of time which any given woman is obliged to spend in her kitchen or nursery, and yet most suffragists talk as though the right to vote carried with it a certain immunity from domestic ties of an irksome nature.

Apropos of this, they are fond of explaining that domestic industries have been taken from the home by man-made corporations; that it is no longer necessary for the mother to spin, dye, and weave the cloth for her children's clothing, or make the candles that light the house.

That very fact ought to fill her with an overwhelming sense of responsibility, and make her realize that time and energy saved from grilling physical labor is to be spent still better in promoting the mental and spiritual welfare of the household.

The case of the unmarried woman, especially if she be self-supporting, is the one customarily harped upon as most completely illustrative of the need for equal suffrage.

Being of such myself, I feel that I have fairly good grounds for asserting that the American woman, even if she is a spinster and a wage-earner, need never find herself in a desperate state, except through extreme personal or family conditions, such as no amount of voting could rectify.

I know I can never be made to look upon myself as a nonentity simply because the men of the community in which I live have been taught to shoulder all of the more disagreeable burdens of actual government.

It would seem quite as reasonable to feel humiliated and disgraced because, in time of war, I could not carry arms. One would suppose that the civilized mind had progressed beyond such petty reckonings.

All of which leads up to the chief object of feminist wrath and censure—that appalling thing known as "indirect influence."

At least, one would think it appalling from the amount of energy consumed in denouncing it by every severe epithet in the catalogue. It is, assert the suffragists, the most pernicious element in the world, and when exerted by members of the female sex, it assumes the proportions of a moral pestilence. But here, again, is one of those verbal mirages which disappear upon close approach.

In the first place, the suffragist recognizes practically only one sort of effective feminine influence—the kind directly connected with the barter and sale of personal charms. Between that, and a hand-to-hand fight at the polling-booth, she can see no shades, grades, nor qualities. The inevitable coloring of a man's thoughts and character by daily association with the women of his family and those outside of it—all this is negligible and unworthy because it is "indirect;" in other words, because their opinions are not pitted with, or against his, as the case may be, in a ballot-box. A curious, distorted view of things, that!

Another kind of analysis shows the utter vagueness of the term under any circumstances.

Suppose it is the will of a certain community that an objectionable place be closed. Voters register this desire through the more or less roundabout method of electing a man who is pledged to accomplish the fact. When he gets into office, he probably sets in motion the machinery which will eventually

close the place, but, when all is said and done, the whole thing is managed entirely by indirect influence, except on the part of the man who expels the offenders with his own hands, or who actually fastens the door with hammer and nails. The vast majority of voters never even know the miscreants by sight. And thus constitutional government is always accomplished indirectly.

It certainly represents a far more creditable moral condition of affairs when the women among our citizens can say to the men within their reach. "I trust you to vote in such a manner that the interests of women are looked after even more carefully than your own, because they need more help." than when they shout defiantly, "You help me accomplish such and such reforms, or else I'll see that our vote hounds you and your friends out of office." Between the two methods is there any comparison in worthiness and decency of purpose? Can there be any question as to the comparative desirability of the motives?

For if there is one forward step upon which the world to-day prides itself, it is upon the change in our educational methods.

"Our grandfathers," we reminisce self-righteously, "were taught that two and two made four because the teacher said so, and if their infant minds did not at once agree or comprehend, a whipping was the only aid to enlightenment. Our children are taught to think for themselves—are guided, not coerced into the light."

We are proud of our honor systems and our moral suasion principles—all of them manifestations of that "indirect influence" so sadly rated by the suffragist. Why isn't the theory the same, whether applied in politics or school?

After all, the really vicious, insidious forms of influence are not going to be much affected by legislation, nor are the higher ones, for that matter.

The mother who feels that her husband and sons cannot be trusted to represent her best interest at the polls, has only herself to thank. It has been her far greater privilege to make the voter; she ought to be able to trust him with the smaller function.

And the woman whom circumstances have placed in the business world has much wherewith to reproach herself if the men who meet her daily cannot reflect something of her own best ideals. When I say that I speak from thoroughly practical experience, not from any visionary ambition to preach about the uplift.

A very serious aspect of the struggle presents itself right at this point; so long as women keep themselves from actual political workings, just so long will their united desires be looked upon as highminded and disinterested. Let them once affiliate themselves with partisan interests—which they must inevitably do, once the vote is theirs—and the confidence of the community has been transmuted into a doubtful regard, forever tainted with a suspicion of the presence of party ties.

It is a colossal sacrifice to make—and for what?

No, they are advocating a mechanical form of influence cancelable by the tramp who happens to follow at the voting booth; I speak for a brand which is literally deathless, and which makes its direct appeal to the very decentest element in any man—his respect for women.

Men have governed weakly, foolishly and harmfully; all the world knows that. But remember this—taking responsibility from them, or lessening it in any way, is not going to strengthen them; rather will it mean that they take a backward step, while we stand still.

It is idle to quote statistics and special cases; they can always be made to serve either end of any argument. I have heard the State of Colorado held up so persistently as an example on both sides of the fence that I could think it must be showing signs of fatigue, if not of actual wear.

And the same is true of Australia. Whether or not they can be made to prove anything at all, I don't know—nor does it greatly matter; the eternal verities may sometimes wear a veil, but they never suffer real change.

This I do know, however, speaking of Colorado. Whereas it has become entirely habitual to point to Denver as the cradle of the juvenile court, and to speak of Judge Lindsey as an example of what a suffrage State can produce, the suffragists take no notice of the fact that Kansas City, without the assistance of women's votes, has developed and takes care of the world's model juvenile court and juvenile improvement system; that it has outstripped Denver and every other city in the country, in proportion to its size.

And then, too, we must all realize that the female vote and the feminist movement combined have had no perceptible effect on a very sore industrial situation. That seems logical enough, when we pause to consider the chaos which reigns in that department of industrial life which is under exclusively feminine control—domestic service.

Here is the grand opportunity for a display of feminine genius in organization and arbitration; women have the field to themselves unmolested, and it would be an excellent one wherein to gain training for more extensive activities.

I was talking one day with a clever little suffragist who had just recovered from a severe operation, and our conversation turned toward a discussion of women as physicians.

"My own doctor," she said, "is a woman, and I have great confidence in her. I think she knows quite as much as any man about anatomy and diagnosis, and the science of medicine, but somehow, when I found that an operation was going to be necessary, I didn't hesitate two minutes before deciding to have a man perform it. Perhaps it's when we reach a crisis calling for decisive executive action that we instinctively turn to men for assistance." And I believe we do.

The reason is so awfully simple, so crudely obvious, that the manner in which it is so often overlooked is absolutely astounding. It is a matter of physiology, after all. As our nervous systems differ, so do our psychological processes, and with them our special capabilities.

At a certain suffrage convention which I was obliged to report for my paper, the presiding officer was an able woman, credited (and rightly, I believe) with an unusual amount of poise. Twice in the course of the first day she became so pitiably overwrought by different crises which arose that she dissolved into a state of hysteria, and the close of the convention found her, naturally, in a deplorable state of nervous exhaustion.

Now these crises were of a sort which men meet perhaps with profanity, and perhaps with an outburst of violence of a physical sort, but from which they manage to recover promptly, with no one the worse for the scuffle.

Training, the suffragist will tell you, is all that is needed to obviate conditions like this; give women a few generations in which to become used to the handling of affairs, and they will meet them as sensibly as men do.

Training? Is training going to alter the physical structure of the sex? Until it accomplishes that, we must still go on expecting to find a feminine temperament in a female body.

The suffrage cause has not been wanting in clever leaders, keen casuists, quick-witted opportunists and scientific supporters, and it has required the combined efforts of all these adherents to gain for it the wide and respectful hearing which it enjoys, and its opportunity, here and there, to become an experiment in social chemistry, for such, and only such, it is. The pity is that experiments of this nature always mean so tragic a loss of energy.

* * * * * *

And what of us—the women who feel that a tremendous new burden, a complicated responsibility, is being unfairly shifted to our already tired shoulders? Some of us still believe that it is for men to do the rough hewing of the social structure, while to us is left the management of subtle detail and supplementary finesse. They need our work as much as we need theirs, and the idea that a ranting sisterhood can transform this healthy state of interdependence into a pitting of one sex against

the other in heart-sickening political warfare, is a very sorry one.

Those of us who have had a chance to see, and who are not afraid to look truth in the face, know the utter and absolute impossibility of maintaining the same footing for men and women who are thrown together even in purely business relationships. We are the women who know the futility of pretense at platonic friendship, and we know that just so long as men are men, just so long will their eyes look upon us through the medium of our sex—even as ours look upon them.

There is nothing intrinsically evil in this, and to cope with it requires only a little quick, philosophical personal adjustment, although at that, the path is a complicated one to tread.

And, knowing this as we do, why, in the name of Heaven, should we be forced into a still more extensive relationship, under the pleasing hypocritical delusion that "men and women ought to be able to work together impersonally?" They oughtn't, as a matter of fact. When they do, it will mean that the motive power of this world has run down, and that its balance wheels are hopelessly out of gear.

These women, whose frantic energy and excited vanity is driving them forward so blindly, do they ever stop to realize that somebody is going to pay the cost of it all? Perhaps not they. No, but succeeding generations, who will some day understand that their troubles and problems have descended upon them because these wild sisters chose to throw the times out of joint, and to set up false relationships; because they wanted to believe that what God had put asunder, they could join together in their own vainglorious, artificial little way.

Possibly they will see the consummation of their efforts, but when a reaction comes, and they find themselves floundering among the ruins they have made, perhaps they will try to imitate the men they envy, and not make an outcry.

They will make it, though; in the end, they will lift up their voices in wild appeal to husbands, fathers, brothers, to come and help them out, and they will make the demand as their right, for by then, perhaps, they will have learned the real, true, honest, clean meaning that lies behind the little word "sex."

THE HISTORY OF ANTI-SUFFRAGE—I

(MASSACHUSETTS)

THE organized opposition of the women of Massachusetts to the extension of suffrage to women dates back to the year 1882. In that year the suffragists appeared to be making considerable headway in the legislature, and it became evident that measures should be taken to make it clear that they did not express the views of the great majority of Massachusetts women. The Hon. George G. Crocker, then a member of the Senate, suggested to Mrs. H. O. Houghton of Cambridge, the desirability of action in this direction; and a meeting was called at Mrs. W. B. Swett's residence in Boston. Remonstrances were prepared and circulated against "the imposition of any further political duties upon women"—school suffrage for women having been adopted in 1879—and the pending suffrage measure was defeated.

After the vote in the legislature, a meeting was held and a committee of thirteen was appointed, to be ready to take any action thought necessary when the next legislature should convene. This committee consisted of Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Mrs. George G. Crocker, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Mrs. James C. Fisk, Mrs. J. C. Hooker, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Mrs. H. O. Houghton, Miss C. S. Parkman, Mrs. O. W. Peabody, Mrs. G. H. Shaw, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier, Mrs. W. B. Swett and Mrs. R. C. Winthrop. Soon after Mrs. James M. Codman, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Miss Phoebe Adam and Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells were added to the committee. There was no formal organization. For a year or two the work of the committee consisted of the obtaining of signatures to the remonstrances to offset the petitions of the suffragists. Later, as the work developed, advice and aid in presenting the anti-suffrage cause before legislative committees were given by Mr. W. H. Sayward, Hon. H. H. Sprague, Hon. G. G. Crocker, Mr. Frank Parkman, Judge Lowell, Mr. T. K. Lothrop, Rev. Brooke Herford, Mr. J. C. Ropes and Rev. Charles B. Rice. Several of these wrote valuable articles for distribution, as did also Mrs. Clara T. Leonard, "Gail Hamilton," Rev. O. B. Frothingham, Mrs. A. D. T. Whitney, Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells, Professor Goodwin of Harvard, Miss Paine of Cambridge, Mr. John Boyle O'Reilly, Mr. Clement K. Fay, and others. This anti-suffrage literature was scattered far and wide. The necessity of employing counsel to represent the committee before legislative committees soon became apparent, and Mr. Arthur Lord, Mr. Thomas Russell, Mr. Charles R. Saunders and Mr. Aaron H. Latham were among those who rendered such assistance at this stage or later. The work of the committee was not restricted to Massachusetts. Aid was freely given in opposing suffrage measures and organizing anti-suffrage sentiment in other States; anti-suffrage literature was sent to the personal addresses of members of legislatures in States where suffrage measures were pending, and communications were sent to newspapers in Massachusetts and other States to present argument against woman suffrage.

The need of a regular organ for this State and inter-State work became apparent, and in 1890 the first number of *The Remonstrance* was published. In that same year a special South Dakota edition of *The Remonstrance* was published and widely distributed through that State, where a suffrage amendment was pending. *The Remonstrance* was published annually until 1908, when it began to be issued quarterly. Originally a four-page paper; it now varies from eight to twelve pages, according to circumstances. Under the fuller and more clearly defined title, *The Remonstrance Against Woman Suffrage,* which was adopted in January, 1914, five twelve-page issues were published in the campaign year 1915. The paper has a large subscription list, at the modest rate of twenty-five cents a year, and its distribution in Massachusetts and other States ranges from 40,000 to 60,000.

It was not until May, 1895, that the "Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women," as it was then known, was organized, Mrs. J. Eliot Cabot was chosen president and Mrs. C. E. Guild secretary. In 1894, a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women had passed the House and came within seven votes of passing the Senate. Confronted by the same proposal, the legislature of 1895 decided, by the adoption of what was known as the "Wellman bill," to submit the question of its expediency to a referendum. The question "Is it expedient that municipal suffrage be granted to the women of Massachusetts?" was accordingly submitted to the votes of all persons qualified to vote for school committee—which, under the school suffrage law, included women—in November, 1895. The newly organized association did not ask the women of the State to participate in the election: it expressly discouraged such activity, but it devoted its efforts to arousing the men of the State to vote against the proposal to impose this heavy political burden upon the women, and co-operated to that end with the Massachusetts Man Suffrage Association, which was organized to oppose the proposition. The result of this test of popular sentiment was that only 22,204 women, out of a possible 575,000 qualified to register and vote, voted in favor of municipal suffrage, while the vote of the men was 86,970 for and 186,976 against—the heaviest majority ever given against any proposition submitted to popular vote in Massachusetts until last November,

when the suffrage constitutional amendment was defeated by a majority of 133,447. There were forty-eight towns in 1895 in which not one woman voted "Yes," and in 137 other towns the women voting "Yes" numbered fifteen or less.

During the intervening twenty years the association—now the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts—has grown steadily in numbers and influence. It has now nearly 37,000 members, all of them women of voting age, distributed over 443 cities, towns and villages, and organized into 137 branch committees. It has maintained convenient headquarters for many years in the Kensington Building, Boylston Street, Boston, where an efficient staff of workers has been employed. It has supported a field secretary, to promote the work of organization. It has furnished columns of anti-suffrage notes and other material to the press. It has published numerous leaflets and pamphlets, which have been widely distributed not only in Massachusetts, but in other States where suffrage campaigns were in progress. It took an active part in the recent campaign, co-operating with the Men's Anti-Suffrage Committee in all the details of the work—organizing rallies, furnishing speakers, maintaining anti-suffrage shops in Boston and other cities and carrying on an extensive publicity work. Organized in connection with the association, and engaged in various philanthropic activities in alliance with it, is the Public Interests League, which has raised large sums of money of Polish relief, Belgian relief, the Red Cross and other causes.

In view of the oft-repeated suffragist accusation that the women who oppose them are mere "butterflies of fashion," women of wealth and leisure who are indifferent to the needs of society, it may be worth while to glance for a moment at some of the women who are and have been active in the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association. The treasurer has been for many years on the State Board of Charities, was one of the first women overseers of the poor ever elected in the State, and has been for many years one of the managers of a large private hospital. One of the officers is president of the Women's Municipal League; another has been for many years a director of the Massachusetts Prison Association and a member of the Massachusetts Child Labor Committee; another was for twenty years on the Massachusetts Prison Commission and is director of a hospital. One member of the Executive Committee has been on the school committee of her town twelve years, is trustee of a library, a manager of the District Nursing Association, and has been prominent in village improvement society work; another is vice-president of a Home for Aged Women and one of the managers of a Home for Crippled Children; another is on the State Library Commission; another is prominent in the Society for Improved Housing of the Poor; another is president of a Village Improvement Society and vice-president of a Hospital League; another has been chairman of the Sanitation Department of the Woman's Municipal League; another is director of the Massachusetts Milk Consumers' Association, director of the Department of Public Health of the Woman's Municipal League and chairman of its Committee on Infant Social Service, which was the pioneer in introducing pre-natal work among the poor; another is treasurer of an Industrial School; another is on the Board of Management of a Home for Workingwomen, a Home for Incurables, a Woman's Free Hospital and an Industrial School for Crippled Children, and another is connected with the work of the National Woman's Federation and the Boston Widows' Society, and is a visitor for the Massachusetts General Hospital.

"PURIFYING POLITICS"

(Jackson, Mich., *Citizen*)

THE female bribery case in Chicago is another happy illustration of the "cleaning up of politics" by woman suffrage.

Promiscuous female suffrage is just as far from purity as promiscuous male suffrage—and more so, for the woman gangster, like the woman poker player, takes a longer chance.

Every man, high or low, crooked or straight, has his woman, a fact which seems to be ignored by the parlor platform women, who, with their coterie of intellectual female comrades, propose to "purify politics" by shoving into the hands of every ignorant and criminal woman, white or black, this dangerous power. Their only argument is that because the male crooks have it, things will be better if the power for evil is doubled by giving the ballot to female crooks, too.

Would it not be wiser to work for a restricted suffrage for men?

(Chicago *Tribune*)

THE imposition of a thirty-three and a third assessment upon salaries is a destructive blow at the pillars of society and the props of politics. Before the days of feminism five per cent. was enough. It was the standard, and any increase is taxation without representation.

(Jack Lait in the Chicago *Herald*)

WE aren't deaf, dumb or blind, Mr. Mayor. And we didn't light on our little soft heads when we were babies, either.

We watched, at first indulgently, then curiously, then tensely, and finally indignantly at the parceling of city jobs by your cronies and your cabinet. Important posts were passed out in the Hotel Sherman like 50-cent pieces to the bums in the First Ward on election day—one to each of the faithful for services rendered and services promised.

Cheap ward hustlers and precinct peanuts scrambled for the crumbs, snarled, fought and licked the hand of the man who tossed the leavings. Brothers-in-law, sisters-in-law, uncles and second cousins of the clan were let in. Folks who tried to see you in the city hall—the office we maintain for you and for us—were referred to rooms in hotels or to back rooms in saloons.

We know that saloon licenses were cut up territorially and that no man, white or black, decent or infamous, could get one unless it came O. K.'d by the boss of the district where the saloon was to be located.

Civil service employees felt for the first time in years that civil service was the comic supplement of the city hall records.

* * * *

Crime broke out as never it had before. There was a great ump-ump of bassoons and you delivered pretty sentiments over the bodies of murdered policemen.

You nailed the saloons on Sundays and then your lawyer jimmied them all night. Vicious cabarets were exposed. You called rude names. Buxbaum's, Freiberg's and Weiss', three of the most notorious dives that ever disgraced a grown-up burg, slammed shut by public anger heard by public servants, you genially reopened.

THE cartoons, editorials and pictures published in connection with the Chicago graft charges prove conclusively that it is worth while to keep the sacred words "wife, mother, sister and sweetheart" forever disconnected with the scandals of politics.

In an imperfect world woman necessarily must face some terrible temptations.

On the whole, those temptations are more serious than man's, just as woman's work is more delicately important than man's.

Many, perhaps most, of woman's temptations come from man.

But he can save her from those of his politics.

CORRECTIONS OF SUFFRAGE STATISTICS

ON page 21 of the hearing before the Committee on Woman Suffrage of the United States Senate, December 15, 1915, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association, says, "In New York City only 20 per cent. of the voters are native born." It seems incredible that any one would make such a statement at any time, with the census reports in reach of every one; but to make such an inaccurate statement before a Committee of the United States Senate to endeavor to influence them in their decision, and for publication as a Senate document, is unpardonable.

The fact is that in the City of New York there were only 318,091 foreign-born voters (page 1077, vol. 1, United States Census, 1910), while there were 568,973 native white and 30,855 negro men of voting age. (Page 1054, vol. 1, United States Census, 1910.) Making a total of 599,828 native-born citizens or 65.3 per cent. of the voters of New York City native born instead of 20 per cent., as Mrs. Catt states.

In an article which Senator Thomas of Colorado had printed in the Congressional Record on February 19, 1916 (page 3239), the statement is made that 54.5 per cent. of the men of voting age in States where women could not vote, voted at the Presidential election of 1912, while 56.6 per cent. (computing from the figures they submit the result shows only 46.5 instead of 56.6) of the men and woman voted at the same election in the six woman suffrage States of Califonia, Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Wyoming and Washington; also that only 12,521,899 votes were cast for President in States where men alone vote, while in fact nearly a million more votes were cast—to be exact, 13,512,097.

Why do the suffragists try to mislead, not only in figures, but in comparisons? If they wanted to be fair, why did they not compare the vote of California, Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Wyoming and Washington with the six adjoining and neighboring States of Oregon, Nevada, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri and South Dakota, where there were no laws discouraging men from voting, such as the grandfathers law and heavy poll taxes, which must be paid in order to exercise the franchise, and which practically disfranchised nearly 2,000,000 negroes in the South. The law in Pennsylvania and some other States permitting only tax payers to vote; educational qualifications in States where there is a large per cent. of illiteracy, etc. Also why did they include the Eastern and New England States when they knew a large part of the nearly 3,000,000 unnaturalized foreign-born men of voting age lived in that part of our country (see page 108, Abst. of Census, 1910). If they had been fair enough to have compared the voting in the six woman suffrage States with the adjoining and neighboring six male suffrage States above mentioned, States with similar laws, except sex, regarding voting and where there are few large cities and the customs of the people are very much alike, they would have found that 1,587,984 men voted in the six male suffrage States before mentioned, or about 69 per cent. of the men over 21 years of age residing in those States, or about 23 per cent. more of the possible voters voted for President in 1912 in the six male suffrage States that did the possible voters in the six adjoining woman suffrage States.

Women will not vote as generally as men when given the ballot, as can be proven in all the woman suffrage states, and can never do so on account of their duty of motherhood.

The suffragists are certainly hard pressed for arguments to uphold the fallacy of "Votes for Women," when they put out such misleading and incorrect figures as they are now doing. Facts seem to be the last thing the emotional and theoretical suffragists want; and fiction that promises much and gives little seems to be the pleasing thing.

HOW SUFFRAGISTS MAKE "9,000,000 WOMEN" SUFFER

HOW many suffragists realize that eight out of every ten women over twenty-one are, or have been, mothers? That there is a child under ten and another between ten and twenty for every married woman and widow in America? How many of them are aware that only seven homes in a hundred have servants, or that in two homes in every three there is a child under five years of age? Do suffragists know that there is an individual dwelling for every married woman in America? That a house is not a home without mother?

Suffragists cannot know these things.

It is inconceivable, if they did, that their representative leaders, like Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt and Mrs. Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale, would go about preaching that women have "too much leisure and too little to do;" that they "have had their hands made idle by modern machinery;" that "woman's work has gone out of the home;" that "the home-kept woman of to-day has less responsibility than the woman of 100 years ago."

Mrs. Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale is reported by southern newspapers as telling the women of that section that "there are 9,000,000 women working in shops under the control of total strangers."

The United States Census, Table I, Volume IV, issued June 20, 1914, declares that there were 1,820,980 women and girls over ten years of age engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries; 108,596 employed in transportation; 468,088 engaged in trade; 13,558 in the public service; and 733,885 engaged in the professions in 1910. A total of 3,145,107, nearly 1,000,000 of whom are not engaged in "shops" under "strangers."

A total of 8,075,772 women and girls over ten years of age were engaged in all gainful occupations, according to the Census, and 53 per cent. of them are in "domestic and personal service" and in agriculture, etc., where women, and not laws made by men in legislatures, regulate their hours of employment and conditions of labor.

But it sounds so much more pathetic to have the whole 9,000,000 working "in shops under the control of total strangers."

The only place that 9,000,000 women are thus employed is on suffrage platforms, where "total strangers" to government statistics work them day and night for the "cause."

The suffragist orator, however, is strangely silent about the 20,000,000 women out of the entire 25,000,000 who are working in their own homes or in the homes of other women, which nearly 3,000,000 are doing.

There is nothing pathetic, to a suffragist, about the hard work done by the millions of mothers in the homes, work which knows no limitation of hours or one-day-rest-in-seven. They would have these busy mothers add the duties of men to their own. They ignore this work, the most vital done in America by either sex, simply because they know that where its importance is fully realized, woman suffrage is never adopted.

In their speeches they destroy the home and deprecate the work of wives and mothers in order to get the vote, which gives the intelligent observer a good indication of what they would do with the vote, if they could.

THE BARGAIN FOR THE BALLOT

(From the Hartford *Courant*, Rep.)

THE suffrage sisters are a chipper little lot. They are up to snuff, just like the old political stagers. They disclosed their 'cuteness and acuteness in their valentine business. So far as we know the valentine has not been used in politics before, but it fits in well with the general sex appeal of the woman suffrage idea. The valentine sent to President Wilson last Monday by these "advanced" sisters is thus described:—

The design was in the shape of a heart, inclosing a group of girls bearing garlands of small hearts, on which the word "Vote" was inscribed. Underneath was written, "Will you be our valentine, if we will be your valentine?"

This was a fair offer. It was as if the beauty chorus of the girl show should promenade through the audience singing: "Will you be mine?" But the offer was multitudinous. It was that of a "group of girls"—no doubt beautiful girls—to one man, but a man who just now holds most of the power of this country in his own hands. The word "vote" on each of the little individual hearts strewed about on the garlands which the beautiful girls carried indicated the nature of the desired bargain. The trade was not to be in kisses but in votes. "Use your great power to secure for us the legal right to vote"—it was thus that these amiable suffrage sisters framed their love message to the President of the United States—"and all the votes that you get for us shall be yours on the day when you need votes more than anything else." This message was plain enough but there evidently was some fear that the President would not fully comprehend it. So it was written out in straight English: "Will you be our valentine, if we will be your valentines?" That "if" covers the desired trade. A modern salesman stamped all over with efficiency diplomas could not have framed the offer to make a political bargain better.

Bargaining with Cannon

And what did this fair maid of the valentine have to say to former Speaker Cannon? Did she remind him that he was on the other side of the hill of active life, and urge him to smoke milder cigars and fewer of them? Did she suggest that his day for "hot and rebellious liquors" was approaching sunset, and that expletive speech was out of vogue? Did she address him as grandpa, and say that she would fetch his slippers? Not at all. She addressed him as if he had the whole political road before him, saying:

The rose is red and the violet blue,
And if you will vote for me—
Why, I can vote for you.

An Object Lesson in Methods

It was bargain day all through with the suffrage sisters on St. Valentine's Day. But it was not a bargain day of the shops, but of the election booths; not for gowns and wraps and stockings, but for votes; not for supplying the needs of the household, but for getting into the great electoral council which at stated intervals decides what policies this country shall make use of, and what course it is necessary for the country to take in order to maintain our common welfare and increase it. The women who wish to add themselves to the electoral forces of the country—the brightest, the most intellectual of them—have thus furnished an object lesson of the ways and methods which strike them as natural and proper in case they should finally get the legal right to act as part of our electoral system. Their conception of the political life into which they wish to enter is that it consists in trading votes—you vote for what I want and you shall have my vote for what you want.

How it Would Work Out

We have had and probably still have enough men who entertain this idea of the responsibilities of self-government without adding a mass of women to their number. For in the coaxing line—the cajoling line—the promising line—man is not in it with woman. Whatever she happened to want very much at the time she would work to get in this old, old way. The most that man can do in this line is to buy votes out and out, but woman carries her sex with her whether she intends to or not. She has always had the advantage of man as a beggar, and probably always will. If all the varied kind of women should throw themselves into our political life with this primitive and unalterable advantage on their side, what we have only caught a glimpse of in their proceedings on St. Valentine's Day would be practiced more and more and by wholesale. For the woman who to-day does exert a strong and wholesome influence upon our political life through the family would not join in these bargain proceedings, and the "beautiful girls," with their garlands of pictured hearts, would have the field all to themselves.

WHY 2,000,000 WOMEN SHOULD NOT VOTE

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT declares that there are not 4,000,000 women voters in the West. She concedes the anti-suffrage contention that less than 2,000,000 women voters would be a fair estimate.

Can we expect suffrage speakers and writers, now that their national president has announced the truth, to cease talking about the "4,000,000 women voters," or will they continue to use them, as the overworked "9,000,000 women in shops" have been employed? As the "father can will away the children from the mother" fallacy has been employed? As the fake story about a Church Council deciding "that women had souls" has been employed?

Anti-suffragists are grateful to Mrs. Catt for her admission, but are not optimistic in the opinion that her followers will now use her figures. Previous experiences have shown that suffragists have generally kept on circulating fallacies, even when some of their best-informed leaders admitted them false.

The facts are the same for both sides. Let us give them, so that the voter can decide the issue on fundamental principles. * * *

After the above was written, the New York *Tribune*, a pro-suffrage newspaper, on March 8th, quoted Mrs. James Wentz, President of the Women's Republican Club, addressing the New York Senate Judiciary Committee, as follows:

"She said that there were 4,396,333 women in the suffrage States. 'My message is just this, those women are going to stand together to see that the rest of the American women have political freedom,' she remarked.

"'Is that a threat?' asked Senator Gilchrist.

"'Just a fact,' said the speaker, gently."

On February 25th, ten days before this statement, the *Tribune* quoted Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt as follows:

"There never were 4,000,000 women voters in the Western suffrage States," she said. "The total number of women is only 3,700,000. Two-thirds of the men in other States are eligible to vote and it is only proper to suppose that the same proportion holds true of women. That makes about 2,800,000 on the voting list, and only 80 per cent. of these can be counted upon to go to the polls and vote. That brings the 4,000,000 down to less than 2,000,000."

It seems "just a fact" that suffragists will continue to use those 4,000,000 women voters, no matter what anybody says.

THE STATE CAMPAIGNS

IOWA

THE Iowa antis have opened headquarters in Waterloo and Charles City, as well as Des Moines. Leaders have been elected for the Congressional districts of the State, and prominent women enlisted in anti-suffrage work in all the chief cities.

Miss Margaret Gay Dolliver, sister of the late United States Senator, will be the leader of the Eleventh Congressional District.

Mrs. Mary Johnston, State Regent of the D. A. R. and General Secretary of the State Federation of Iowa Women, and Mrs. C. C. Colgrove, a member of the Advisory Board of the State Federation of Clubs, have been added to the list of Vice-Presidents.

Miss Minnie K. Bronson and Miss Marjorie Dorman have been speaking before chambers of commerce, labor unions, and at other meetings for the last two months, and expect to develop a number of local speakers against woman suffrage, many of whom have shown great ability in debates and discussions.

Literature has been distributed in many sections, which has been contributed in part by the National, Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania associations.

The press of the State is giving each side a chance to present its arguments, and editors on each side are usually fair to the other.

The call for concentration in Iowa has developed the fact that many prominent anti-suffrage leaders of other States are native Iowans, and Miss Bronson is planning a "home coming week" when they will all be working to defeat woman suffrage in their native State.

Mrs. N. C. Young, President of the North Dakota association, Mrs. John Balch, President of the Massachusetts association, Colonel Irish, of California, and many others who will take part in the Iowa campagin, are, like Miss Bronson, natives of the Hawkeye State.

Mr. Arthur Brisbane, editor of the Hearst papers, created much amusement in Iowa recently by speaking for woman suffrage one day and against prohibition the next.

New York women, according to the news, are going to Kansas to vote.

Sufferin' Kansas!—*N. Y. American.*

WEST VIRGINIA

IN West Virginia, the opposition to woman suffrage is becoming pronounced. Prominent women in various parts of the State are working quietly against woman suffrage, and perfecting plans for a State-wide organization at an early date. The business men, merchants and lawyers, as well as some of the prominent editors, are opposed to woman suffrage, and the debates on the subject in several schools have been decided in favor of the antis.

In Charleston, anti-suffrage literature has been diligently circulated, as well as in Huntington and other cities.

The traveling in West Virginia is very difficult at this season, consequently little work can be done in the rural communities until Spring.

Suffragists have been active at comparatively few places, but are freely using the time-honored arguments about "liquor" and "the women in industry" with the usual inaccuracies.

West Virginia is a dry State, like Iowa, so the liquor bugaboo is having a hard time getting a hearing.

In the "woman worker" argument, the suffragists are confronted with the fact that West Virginia has the smallest proportion of women in the United States "gainfully occupied." Only 12 per cent. of West Virginia's women are gainfully occupied, and of this 12 per cent., over 58 per cent. are engaged in domestic service and agricultural employments. And only two-thirds of the remainder are over twenty-one.

The 4 per cent. of the women in West Virginia who are employed in any industry affected by legislation would be in a hopeless condition if it were true that they needed a vote to get good laws, or that the men of their families did not have their interests at heart.

If thirty thousand women workers cannot get three hundred thousand men workers to give them legislative justice without the ballot, the figures show that it would be absolutely impossible with the ballot.

It is easy for one woman to get ten men to give her anything she needs in the way of protection, but there is no way of her out-voting them for it.

The absurdity of the suffrage contentions are also illustrated by the fact that West Virginia passed a workmen's compensation act in 1913 which gives its widows and orphans better protection than that passed by Wyoming, after forty-five years of woman suffrage, in 1915. The West Virginia widow is entitled to compensation until death or remarriage; the Wyoming widow to not over $2,000 for all. The widows of West Virginia are also given one-third more for burial expenses than the widows of Wyoming who have the vote.

ALABAMA

THE Alabama Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was organized on February 11th, with the following officers: President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma; vice-presidents, Mrs. Nathan Kahn, Kate M. Gardner, Selma; Lida B. Robertson, Mobile, and Mrs. John F. Burns, Burnsville; secretary and treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

About 1,000 members were reported within a few days of the organization. The pledge of protest, which was signed by the members, follows:

"We, the undersigned white women of Alabama, being of sound mind and average intelligence, do hereby publicly and earnestly protest, as individuals and collectively, against having thrust upon us the issue of 'Votes for Women.'

"Having fully considered the question and believing that the great majority of the women of Alabama regard to ballot and the necessary civic responsibilities which it would entail, including the entrance of women into the turmoil of politics, as unmixed evils, tending rather to degrade and lower the regard of our sex than to elevate it, we take this means of letting the lawmakers of our State know that we will not remain silent and have the radical measure thrust upon us without entering our most solemn protest.

"We proclaim that the men of Alabama, as a whole, have always, and will continue to love, honor and protect their women, at least so long as they remain within the sphere to which nature and nature's God have assigned them.

"We insist that all necessary reforms in government are as ardently desired by the men as by the suffragettes, and that any changes that may be desired by the women of Alabama in the laws of their State will be gladly made upon their request, if the same are proper and reasonable, without lowering the dignity of the sex by needless public demonstration and demands for the ballot."

In Selma new members are coming in at the rate of fifty a day.

THE STATE CAMPAIGNS

NEW YORK

THE anti-suffrage idea of the greatest good to the greatest number has found most enthusiastic support in the organization of "The Public Interest League of Business and Professional Women," which declares itself "the natural reaction of thinking people against the tendency of the age and one of the greatest menaces of the time—individualism and self-centeredness."

The plan of the League includes two series of dinners each month, at which an open forum and discussions of the future work of women are held.

The first dinner was at the Cafe Boulevard, the last Sunday in February, and met with great success. The last Sunday and the second Monday of each month are the dinner days, and the following subjects will be discussed at future meetings:

"Women Working as Women," "Women Working with Men—or Against Them," "Woman's Obligations to Other Women," "Work that Is Left Undone," "Responsibilities and Privileges," "Evolution and Ethics" and "Betty in Business."

The Monday dinners are exclusively for women, the Sunday dinners for members and guests of both sexes.

The Junior Anti-Suffrage League of New York, of which Miss Carolyn Van Cortlandt is president; Miss Garetta H. Rebould, secretary, and Miss Geraldine Adee, treasurer, held a dance at the Plaza Hotel on March 1st, the proceeds of which were divided between preparedness and anti-suffrage.

Prominent officials and their wives were invited from the Navy Yard and Governors Island, and the affair realized over $1,800.

The Juniors decided to contribute to the preparedness of the aviation corps.

MRS. ALBERT C. RUST, of the New York Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, has received the following letter from a member of Congress, which is representative of the opinion which led to the rejection of the Susan B. Anthony amendment at this session:

"Your very interesting letter is at hand. You need have no fear that I shall vote for a suffrage amendment to the National Constitution if it comes up during this Congress.

"I suppose there have been ten delegations of beautiful women—not all beautiful but some—in my office trying to urge me to vote for what they call the Susan B. Anthony amendment. I have told them all unequivocally that I would not do so. I consider that the State of New York is large enough to settle the woman suffrage matter for herself. That we did not propose to be out-voted by a lot of pocket-borough States of the far west, one of which is not as large as my own county, and several of which are smaller than my Congressional District. I have told them also that it is my opinion that woman suffrage would receive a smaller vote in this Congress than in the last one if forced to a vote."

As the gentleman certainly deserves a rest from suffrage solicitation, his name is withheld.

MASSACHUSETTS

MRS. JOHN BALCH, accompanied by Mrs. Edwin Ford, State Organizer, and Mrs. Henry Preston White, one of our best speakers, left Boston February 23d for Iowa, where they will spend several weeks in active work in the State campaign. On February 1st this Association shipped to Iowa, as a contribution, 326 pounds of posters, leaflets and pamphlets.

Work among the Massachusetts branches has been very active during the past month. Jamaica Plain held a very successful silver tea for the benefit of both home and National Associations. Cambridge has conducted a series of whist parties, which have netted satisfactory returns; Chestnut Hill reports gratifying results in raising funds, and other branches are fast carrying out plans to help in the Iowa campaign.

The work of organizing new branches and awakening interest in new towns goes steadily on; a number of meetings have been arranged for the near future in hitherto unresponsive localities. The number of visitors at headquarters and the requests received for literature from all over the country show unabated interest in the anti-suffrage cause. It has been particularly interesting to note the number of requests for material for debates received from California, where a State-wide debate is being carried on in the schools, under the direction of the Bureau of Public Discussion of the University of Calfornia, as to the advisability of the adoption of the Federal Amendment granting women the vote.

The Public Interests League, in addition to its Red Cross and civic betterment work has conducted a food booth at a three days' fair held this week in Mechanics Building, Boston, by the friends of Poland.

Plans have been perfected and rehearsals are being held for a play to be given by members of the Association for the benefit of the cause, May 1st and 2d.

PENNSYLVANIA

PLANNING to forestall another suffrage amendment campaign, the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has directed the organization of branches in every senatorial and representative district for the purpose of seeing candidates who hope to be elected to the 1917 Legislature. Efforts will be directed to advance the interests of candidates known to be opposed to another amendment campaign.

The whole House of Representatives is to be chosen and half of the Senators. The direct primaries, at which they will be nominated, will be held on May 16, the third Tuesday of the month. Those who spoke at the monthly meeting, March 1st, were Mrs. S. H. Guilford, of Lansdowne; Mrs. John B. Heron, of Pittsburgh, and Mrs. George P. White. Charity work under the auspices of the Association is also to be organized throughout the State.

MORE DEFEATS

MARYLAND, Virginia and Oklahoma have defeated woman suffrage bills in their Legislatures within the last month. The Oklahoma House was reported to have passed a suffrage referendum bill on February 12th, but the Secretary of State, on February 22d, sent the following letter to the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage:

"The proposed amendment of the Constitution relative to Woman Suffrage, which was proposed at the Special Session of the Legislature was lost, and I am unable to furnish you with a copy of same."

(Signed) J. L. LYON,
Secretary of State.

The bill providing for a woman suffrage amendment was defeated in the Maryland House of Delegates by a vote of 64 to 36. Although the Senate had passed the bill to a third reading, the action of the House disposes of the matter at this session of the Legislature.

New Jersey defeated Presidential suffrage for women on March 7th by a vote of 10 to 3 in the Senate.

A WARNING TO SUFFRAGISTS

MRS. CATT'S recent statement to the Des Moines, Ia., *Tribune*, to the effect that she knew liquor interests were contributing to anti-suffrage work, but did not know "how it was being done in Iowa," which received a prompt and effective answer from the Iowa antis, also produced among the editors a demand for a "square deal." The following extract from an editorial in the Sioux City *Journal*, written by a man who apparently believes in woman suffrage, ought to convince suffragists that unfair methods not only lower the dignity of discussion, but actually hurt the cause of woman suffrage:

"Mrs. Catt, in her ardor for woman's rights and her determination to add Iowa to the list of suffrage States, may be carried beyond the limits of political wisdom in attacking the opposition. Miss Flora Dunlap went beyond such bounds in commenting a few weeks ago upon the launching in Des Moines of a campaign against the constitutional amendment. Therefore, this word of warning from a friendly source.

"The suffragists insist that the liquor interests are opposed to votes for women. In all likelihood this is true. But in the interest of fairness the suffragists must differentiate between opposition of such selfish, mercenary sort and opposition of reputable women who cannot bring themselves to favor suffrage. The suffragists cannot tar some of the best women of Iowa with the same stick with which they tar brewers and distillers and saloonkeepers and hope to make capital out of it for their cause. It would be hard to think up a poorer piece of politics.

"In the Middle West, of which Iowa is such an important part, nothing is more poular than the square deal. Let the suffragists tie to that policy in the assurance that it will get them everything that is coming to them. It is a square deal which the suffragists demand from the men. Let them accord a square deal to sisters who hold opinions that differ from theirs. Let them marvel, if they care to, at the woman who not only does not want to vote, but is determined even to withhold the ballot from such women as do long for it, but they must not vilify her or impugn her motives. It is often said that woman's one best argument in the struggle for the vote is her inherent right to it. The sooner she concentrates her forces along that line of attack the better off she will be, and likewise the cause of equal suffrage."

AN IGNORANT INDORSEMENT?

MRS. Norman deR. Whitehouse, Chairman of the Woman Suffrage Party of New York, declares that anti-suffragists have distorted reports of her support of a revolutionary magazine which recently published an offensive ballad.

She says that her indorsement of the magazine was signed before the ballad in question was published. That fact is immaterial, as Mrs. Whitehouse's statement, no matter when signed, was not printed until a month after the publication of the verses had excited such wide public indignation that the magazine was taken off many newsstands. Mrs. Whitehouse had a month in which to "kill" her indorsement before it was printed, no matter when it was signed.

Her alleged ignorance of this "Ballad" is of no consequence. The statement signed by her said:

"In cartoon, in verse, in editorial, in story, the ——— has stood for us all along the line as no other magazine in America has. When we fight for suffrage, for economic independence, for professional opportunities, for scientific sex knowledge, there stands the ———, always understanding, always helping."

What was the character and the history of this publication *before* Mrs. Whitehouse indorsed it in such glowing words?

Its favorite cartoon was the Crucifixion! Subjects like the Last Supper were ridiculed, and bishops, priests and ministers held up to scorn in practically every issue. Its editorials glorified the sentiment "No Gods, No Masters" for a year before Mrs. Whitehouse signed her approval. It had called the church a "dump" and the home a "hole," it had said that no man was free "until he could tell his job and his boss to go bark at one another" and that he could not do this until he was legally exempted from the support of wife and children!

This magazine also runs a book store, listing *twice* as many books under the subject of *sex* as under suffrage. One of these books, written by a suffrage leader, and also sold by a New York suffrage association for two years—and within three weeks—was openly advertised as having been suppressed by Anthony Comstock, and as having been refused advertising space in *every New York newspaper*. Most of the books listed under this heading in the publication contain material unfit to print, and one in particular advocates trial marriage and free love.

If Mrs. Whitehouse was ignorant of all these things when she signed her indorsement of the magazine as the foremost representative of the modern woman, she must ask us to believe that the suffrage leader of New York will indorse the most radical publication in the country, and will sign a statement calling its cartoons, verses, stories and editorials the best in America for her cause without knowing or reading them! Her confidence in the magazine must have been all the more complete if she accepted its sentiments as most representative without question.

NOTES AND COMMENT

A CORRECTION

IN the February number of the WOMAN'S PROTEST, Mrs. John Rogers was mentioned as having taken part in the so-called "Raid Upon the President." Mrs. John Rogers writes to THE PROTEST as follows:

"Please do not confuse me with my daughter-in-law, Mrs. John Rogers, Jr. You have put my name down as visiting the President in New York to urge him to put through Congress the Susan B. Anthony bill—something I abhor.

"I am Mrs. John Rogers and an anti-suffragist and always have been."

THE PROTEST regrets that the omission of "Jr." in this instance caused an unfortunate mistake.

The occurrence, however, will make a good text for editors and others to use in instructing reporters and writers to get all proper names with absolute accuracy. In this instance, the "Jr." was omitted in a score of clippings on this incident, as well as in the PROTEST.

Suffragists have tormented a Congressman with the fact that he is opposed to woman suffrage while having three sisters who are suffragists.

"If they could only grasp the significance of this pig-iron fact, they would not annoy me," the Congressman remarks.

"Here is a story of a Chicago woman who says that present marriage laws make woman the slave of man," said the square-jawed matron, as she looked up from the newspaper.

"Why don't they enforce the laws, then?" meekly asked Mr. Henpeck.

GUS C. EDWARDS.

The lady jury had been out for hours.

The judge looked tired, the clerk yawned, the loungers slept.

The bailiff, after listening at the keyhole several times, shook his head with a discouraged air.

And then, quite unexpectedly, the jury announced it was ready to report, and the twelve ladies filed in.

"Have you agreed upon a verdict?" the judge demanded.

The forelady nodded and smiled.

"We have agreed upon twelve verdicts, your honor," she told him, in her flutelike voice.

"You are discharged," roared the judge.

"Isn't he horrid!" said the ladies.

G. C. E.

Stanley Bowdle, former Congressman from Ohio, was recently asked this poser:

"Why does a woman take her husband's name when she marries?"

"Why does she take everything else he's got?" Mr. Bowdle returned.

The woman's vote in Chicago has decreased by nearly one-half in the last year. The vote in 1915 at the primary election was 152,636; the vote at the 1916 primary only 81,121, a decrease of 71,515.

The election was an important primary for the nomination of aldermen, and one of the most hotly contested campaigns ever waged in Chicago politics.

The Chicago registration of women has dropped by 10 per cent. since the election in April, 1915. The vote at that time, though it represented but 40 per cent. of the number of women over twenty-one, was probably the greatest Chicago women will cast.

Chicago is the only place where the effect of woman suffrage can be determined with accuracy, as only in Illinois are the votes of women separated from those of the men.

The minority of Chicago women who vote has not been able to improve politics. In fact, Chicago politics is said to be in a worse state now than ever. The women are probably no more responsible than the men, as they voted exactly like the men. But Chicago politics is more extended. It embraces both sexes, in the scandals as well as the votes. It costs more than ever to the taxpayer, and the extra cost of double-suffrage government is sheer waste.

If anyone were to propose that every legislature be nearly doubled in members, with women appointed to the extra places, somebody would ask why. If we obtained no better government under the scheme everybody but the office-holders would want to return to a simpler form of representation. The people are beginning to look at woman suffrage in this logical manner, as an added expense and dangerous experiment of no value to women or the State. It will be recognized, eventually, as a menace instead of a means to good government.

A California woman writes to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST as follows:

"The men here say that woman suffrage has only increased taxes and coarsened the women by making them act more like the men. No one thought it would be adopted when it was voted upon. As an illustration, one man says that he was sitting at table with eight others when the election returns came in. They were shocked when they learned suffrage had been adopted. Only one of the nine had voted against it, though all were opposed to suffrage.

"It seems to me that 'Preparedness' should be your slogan, especially preparedness in having all your forces organized for instant use against suffrage whenever it threatens a State."

California, largest State with full suffrage for women, adopted this measure by a majority of only 3,500, while 350,000 men neglected to vote on the question.

Preparedness *should* be the anti-suffrage slogan. The antis have never lost a State which was fully organized for home defense against suffrage.

The Union League Club of New York, at a meeting presided over by Hon. Elihu Root, recently adopted a resolution to appoint a committee to appear before the General Assembly to oppose suffrage bills.

The Wyckoff Republican Club of Ridgewood, N. J., at a recent meeting, went on record as opposed to further discussion of woman suffrage. It concluded from the result of the election last fall that the issue is a dead one in that State, and unanimously refused all pleas to permit the suffragists to debate the issue in the club house.

The Republican party seems in no humor to assist at the reviving of votes-for-woman as a political issue. Suffragists who attended its recent New York State convention received the same encouragement that would greet the sale of last year's baseball tickets.

The New York Democratic convention declined to be frightened or persuaded into indorsing woman suffrage.

A prominent suffragist was fined instead of committed to prison for smuggling, because a judge with Southern chivalry believes woman's place is out of jail. Another illustration of the terrible oppression of women who have no votes.

The most humane law ever enacted in America was obtained by one woman, an anti-suffragist, before woman suffrage was established in any State. Dorothea Dix, the Florence Nightingale of this country, who was superintendent of nurses in the Civil War, originated the present system of separating the insane from other prisoners. The hospitals for the insane of a dozen States were established through her efforts. The United States Congress passed a bill in 1854 allowing 10,000,000 acres of the public domain to be devoted to the benefit of the indigent insane, at the request of Dorothea Dix. President Pierce vetoed the bill as unconstitutional. Dorothea Dix's ideal of woman's work in government was: "She must be the incarnation of a purely disinterested idea appealing to universal humanity, irrespective of party or sect." No woman with this ideal wants woman suffrage.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*
Woman's Relation to Government *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
The Blank Cartridge Ballot *Rossiter Johnson*
Address (Made before Constitutional Convention, 1894) *Hon. Elihu Root*
Taxation and Suffrage *Frederick Dwight*
Woman and the Law *Francis M. Scott*
First Legislative Address *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis (Editorial, *New York Times, February* 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy, etc.
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights *vs.* Woman's Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Should Women Vote? *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage *Reprint from Yale Review*
Feminism and Socialism *Reprint from Unpopular Review*
Dodgers—Statistics

Silk Pins.....10c. each
Celluloid Buttons.....5c.
Ribbon.....10c. and 15c. a yard
Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

27 William Street Room 1903 New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Questionnaire to Professors in Universities and Colleges *Prof. Munroe Smith*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound *Prof. William T. Sedgwick*
Brief Before the Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, December, 1913 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Colorado and Suffrage *John C. Ten Eyck*
Consent of the Governed *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis (Editorial, *New York Times, February* 8, 1915)
Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals.
The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman *Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar*
What Women Have Done Without the Ballot *Everett P. Wheeler*
(Republished by Permission from *The Reply.*)
The Influence of Christianity Upon the Condition of Woman *Everett P. Wheeler*

Price 5 cents Each—$3.00 a hundred—25 for $1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Woman Adrift ($1.50) *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel.
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage *Mrs. George A. Caswell*
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed *Adapted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*
Suffrage Statements Answered
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons *Caroline M. Parker*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage *Frank Foxcroft*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail *Mrs. A. J. George* (Independent)
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform *Margaret C. Robinson*
Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.
Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1916

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....